

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated June 30, 2005, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

In order to advance prosecution, claim 2 has been placed in independent form by incorporation of its subject matter into parent claim 1. Claim 2 has been cancelled, and claims 3-6 have been amended to depend directly from claim 1.

The rejection presented at Section 3 of the Action is traversed for the reason that the system originally defined in claim 2, and now defined in claim 1, is not disclosed in the applied reference. It is noted, in this connection, that the explanation of the rejection of claim 2 makes absolutely no mention of the components originally defined in claim 2.

In specific response to the rejection of claim 2, it is submitted that the applied reference does not disclose a tube, or suction source, as now defined in claim 1.

It is noted that a Request for Withdrawal of the Finality of the Rejection was filed on April 21, 2005, and a written response to that request has not been received. However, even if the finality of the rejection is not withdrawn, it is submitted that the present amendment is clearly enterable since it does nothing more than place an existing claim in independent form. Nor does this amendment alter the scope of claims 3-6.

It is submitted that inasmuch as the reference relied upon to support the rejection of claim 2 does not disclose the features defined in that claim, and no explanation of the basis for the rejection of that claim is

Appln. No. 10/005,699
Amd. dated July 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

presented in the last Office Action, claim 1, as amended,
should now be considered to be allowable.


It is further noted that dependent claims 5 and 8
have not been formally rejected. Although the rejection
presented in Section 5 of that action would appear to be
directed to those claims, no claims were specifically
identified in the statement of the rejection.

Accordingly, it is submitted that all the pending
claims should now be considered allowable over the prior art
and it is therefore requested that the prior art rejections be
reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1 and 3-10 be allowed
and that the Application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the
application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is
invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining
issues.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By


Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:jec
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\D\Donm\DonMichael 27\pto\AMDFNL 20 JUL 05.doc